

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Editorially amend the specification.
2. Cancel claims 1 – 26 without prejudice or disclaimer.
3. Add new claims 27 – 71.
4. Submit replacement drawings.
5. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

B. THE NEW CLAIMS

New independent claim 27 specifies that the data mechanism comprises a container structure comprising content expressed in the foreign communications protocol so that the node structure can serve as a conduit for the container and need not interpret the content of the container structure. The container structure is discussed throughout the specification, such as page 16, lines 15 *et seq* and page 17, line 13 *et seq*. That the container content is expressed in the foreign communications protocol is apparent, e.g., from page 5, line 8 – 12 (“the generic mechanism includes a standardized data “container” structure that will include whatever information is necessary to specify a communication to a neighboring cell system in the communication language (whether common or foreign) of that neighboring cell system” (emphasis added). See, also, page 21, line 15. the fact that the node structure serves as a conduit for the container and need not interpret the content of the container structure is readily understood from page 5, lines 22 *et seq* and page 22, lines 12 *et seq* of the specification.

New dependent claim 28 specifies that the container structure comprises communication parameters for the foreign communication system. Support for new dependent claim 28 resides, e.g., on page 21, lines 15 – 17.

New dependent claim 29 specifies that the communication parameters for the foreign communication system are written by the foreign communication system. For support, *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 15.

New dependent claim 30 specifies that the content of the container structure includes a message or command dictated by the foreign communications protocol. New dependent claim 31 specifies that the command is a handover command. *See, e.g.*, page 22, lines 2 – 5 of the specification.

New dependent claim 32 states that the radio access network is a Universal Mobile Telephone System (UMTS) radio access network and the foreign communication system is one of a Group Special Mobile (GSM) or Personal Digital Cellular (PDC) communication system.

New enhanced capability 33 specifies that the radio access network is a third generation system and the foreign communication system is second generation system. For support, *see, e.g.*, the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the specification.

New dependent claim 34, supported by original independent claim 1, specifies that the container structure comprises a dedicated data mapped structure generic to said radio access network and said foreign communication system such that said generic data mapped structure transports both handover data content unique to said first communication protocol and handover data content unique to said foreign communication protocol.

New dependent claims 35 – 40 correspond to original claims 28 – 33, respectively.

New independent claim 41 resembles original independent claim 8, but, like new independent claim 27, specifies that the data mechanism comprises a container structure comprising content expressed in the foreign communications protocol so that

the node structure can serve as a conduit for the container and need not interpret the content of the container structure. Further, new independent claim 41 uses the word “second” network rather than “core” network.

New dependent claims 42 – 54 are similar to new dependent claims 28 – 40, respectively. New dependent claim 55 specifies that the “second” network is a core network.

New independent claim 56 is a method claim which includes preamble language from both original independent claim 1 and original independent claim 8, and which has method acts analogous to and understood from independent claims 27 and 41. New dependent method claims 57 – 69 are analogous to new claims 28 – 40, respectively; and new dependent claim 70 is analogous to new dependent claim 35. New dependent claim 71 includes limitations from original dependent claim 20.

C. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,737,703 to Byrne. Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,912,230 to Salkini. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants fail to see any teaching of, e.g., the claimed container structure, in either of the two applied references. That is, neither U.S. Patent 5,737,703 to Byrne nor U.S. Patent 6,912,230 to Salkini teach or suggest a container structure comprising content expressed in the foreign communications protocol so that a node can serve as a conduit for the container and need not interpret the content of the container structure.

U.S. Patent 6,912,230 to Salkini states, in col. 27, lines 5 *et seq.*, that its aircore platform 200 (see Fig. 28) “is designed to use, as much as possible, generic processing

for mobile unit hand offs. Thus, communication for mobile units operating according to different protocols, e.g., GSM, TDMA, CDMA and AMPS are handled in a generic fashion...”.

Applicants respectfully submit that the “generic processing” cryptically mentioned in U.S. Patent 6,912,230 to Salkini refers to a procedure order of operational steps for handover, so that handovers of differing protocols can be handled essentially according to the same methodology. Salkini has no description of a generic container structure expressed in a foreign communications protocol and having content that need not be interpreted by a Salkini node. Rather, from columns 27 and 28 it clearly seems that the aircore platform 200 and other Salkini nodes need to know and do utilize the content of specific information described in the various Salkini handover scenarios. Thus, a supposed generic methodology as described by Salkini is an entirely different thing than a generic container.

Applicants further see no teaching or suggestion in U.S. Patent 5,737,703 to Byrne of a container structure comprising content expressed in the foreign communications protocol so that the node structure can serve as a conduit for the container and need not interpret the content of the container structure. Byrne’s CCT 200 appears fully knowledgeable¹ regarding both the DECT and GSM networks, and that the networks have sufficient knowledge of each other to obviate any need of such a container structure. In the latter regard, the Byrne nodes for the differing networks (CCFP 505 and MSC 138) are connected by a direct link 530 which transmits the necessary control signals therebetween to facilitate handover between systems [col. 7, lines 50 *et seq*]. The Fig. 4 description of a signal processing circuit for speech handover between a GSM and DECT

¹ In Byrne handover is facilitated, at least in one embodiment, by the CCT 200 having independently operative DECT and GSM transceiver sections 220, 230 [col. 8, lines 20 *et seq*]. The Byrne CCT has a microprocessor 210 which apparently knows the signaling protocols and data encryption for both cordless operation and cellular operation [col. 5, lines 65 – col. 6, lines 16].

network (described, e.g., in col. 9, lines 10 *et seq*) tend to indicate that the networks know parameters of the other networks (such as the different system delays [see col. 9, lines 44 *et seq*]), thereby seemingly obviating the need for a generic container.

D. MISCELLANEOUS

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____/H. Warren Burnam, Jr./

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsb
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100